UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/789,694	02/27/2004	Stephen M. Potter	3932	9316
22474 Clements Berna	7590 02/24/201 ard PLLC	EXAMINER		
1901 Roxborou Suite 250	gh Road	MCGUTHRY BANKS, TIMA MICHELE		
Charlotte, NC 28211			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1793	
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			02/24/2010	ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

patlaw@worldpatents.com

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)	
10/789,694	POTTER ET AL.	
Examiner	Art Unit	
TIMA M. MCGUTHRY-BANKS	1793	

	Thurst Milliage That Brance 1750				
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the correspondence address				
THE REPLY FILED <u>12 February 2010</u> FAILS TO PLACE THIS	APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.				
application, applicant must timely file one of the following application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appe	the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the eal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time				
a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing	date of the final rejection.				
no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire la	dvisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection. b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO				
MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(
have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of ext under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the s	on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee tension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee thortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed,				
	liance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of				
	nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a				
3. 🛛 The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, b	out prior to the date of filing a brief, will <u>not</u> be entered because				
(a) ☐ They raise new issues that would require further cor	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·				
(b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE belo	·				
(c) ☑ They are not deemed to place the application in bet appeal; and/or	ter form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for				
(d) They present additional claims without canceling a	corresponding number of finally rejected claims.				
NOTE: See Continuation Sheet. (See 37 CFR 1.1	16 and 41.33(a)).				
4. \square The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12	21. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).				
5. $\ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \$					
non-allowable claim(s).	owable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the				
how the new or amended claims would be rejected is prov The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed:	☑ will not be entered, or b) ☐ will be entered and an explanation of rided below or appended.				
Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected: <u>27-40</u> .					
Claim(s) rejected. <u>27-40</u> . Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:					
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE					
The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will <u>not</u> be entered because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).					
The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will <u>not</u> be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome <u>all</u> rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).					
 The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER 	n of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.				
	t does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:				
12. ☐ Note the attached Information <i>Disclosure Statement</i> (s). (13. ☐ Other:	PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)				
TMM	(Coordinated Market and Market				
1 IVIIVI	/George Wyszomierski/ Primary Examiner Art Unit 1793				

Continuation of 3. NOTE: The examiner contends that US '690 does not claim (as opposed to disclose) adding the ore to the furnace at a temperature of 400 C. The examiner made no comment on the disclosure, which teaches the quote by applicant at column 5, lines 43-46. The examiner is relying on the claims of US '690, as appropriate for a double patenting rejection.

Regarding applicant's intent to change the upper limit of the temperature range from about 200 C to less than 200 C, a *prima facie* case of obviousness exists where the claimed ranges and prior art ranges do not overlap but are close enough that one skilled in the art would have expected them to have the same properties. See MPEP § 2144.05 I. Applicants can rebut a *prima facie* case of obviousness based on overlapping ranges by showing the criticality of the claimed range or by showing that the art, in any material respect, teaches away from the claimed invention. See MPEP § 2144.05 III.

The examiner maintains that the water content will be the same because the temperature range is obvious. Regarding the step of providing lump feed material (Claim 27) including storing said lump feed ... in an open atmosphere stockpile (Claim 33), the generation of high levels of fines as argued by applicant is not claimed. The assertion that storage relieves internal stresses would be an inherent property of lump ore since the "microporous structure of the lump ore is sedimentary in nature." Applicant does not provide any comparative results above or below 200 C to distinguish the instant claims from the prior art. One example in the specification is for 500-750 C (page 6, line 5).